

135 W. 41st St.,

May 15, 1887,

My Dear May,

Yesterday I made a final examination of my manuscript to note the few changes made by you before the reading, and to copy the portions which had been made a little obscure by various marks. Having completed this task, I sent it, through Mr. Howland, to the Society of Antiquity, to await the convenience of the printer. I thought most of your changes and gladly adopted them. To this, however, there were two or three exceptions. I retained Giddings's remark, "You beat the bush," &c., but with an addition which I am sure will remove the objection you felt to it, and

which occurred to me, ^{also} while writing. It is what Giddings actually said. My addition will guard against ^{any} perversion of his words, showing it to ~~be~~ ^{have been} a characteristic bit of humor on his part, implying nothing but a perception that a thorough-going, unperfastioned Garrisonian could hardly be made in a day from pro-slavery material. Of course the phrases in this last sentence does not appear in the review, but only the idea. I wrote that the pro-slavery clergy in 1854 were "in a hole," and you substituted place for hole, which seemed to me flat and weak. I changed it to morass. I gave up "humbuggery" with some reluctance, since, ^{neither} your substitute nor any other word that I could

think of is its exact equivalent.
Webster accepts humbug and hum-
bugger as legitimate words, with
no stigma on account of their origin.
If all the words that at first were
esteemed "low" by lexicographers ~~were~~
should now be torn from the Eng-
lish vocabulary, it would bleed
to death. Languages are mutable
by nature, and are always shedding
old words and embracing new
ones. And always the same battle
is going on between those who
recognize this truth and those
who seem to deny it. But I
willingly surrendered "humbuggers"
to your classic taste. My college,
you see, was a printing-office and
an editor's chair; hence my style
is sometimes more forcible than ele-
gant. But with you as "my guide,
philosopher and friend," I cannot go
far astray. I am truly grateful for
your critical suggestions.

I hope the printer of the Aut.

Soc. will get my review in type at
no very distant day. Of course I ex-
pect to read my own proofs. Will
you please consider all the questions
that relate to the issue of a poem
pocket - the number needed, whether
with or without a cover, &c., the
cost, and how the money can be
raised. Of course it will require
but a small sum at most. It
will be a question between cheap
and very cheap.

What think ^{you} of the enclosed
title-page?

All things considered, I am
glad, since the Herald could
not print the whole of the review
that no abstract was furnished.

I am nearly recovered
from my pull-back of last week
and hope you are gaining in
strength. Yours, ever,

Oliver Johnson.